



THE NATIONAL Voter

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U. S.

1026 17th STREET, N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

League Testifies At Water Hearings

"My Big Day"—"Still in the Afterglow"—"The Great Encounter"—"A Grand Occasion"—"A Fun Experience"—"Great Spectator Sport"—"Fascinating Game of Politics" are not titles of new movies or new songs. They are comments of League members about their experience of testifying before the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources at hearings held in 19 states between October 7 and December 8. The League was the only organization to testify in every state.

As League members know, this Committee was established in April 1959. It is composed of members of the four Standing Committees of the Senate which have a primary responsibility for legislation involving water resources—Interior and Insular Affairs, Public Works, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Agriculture and Forestry.

Satisfaction with the experience seems to have been mutual. When Senator Kerr, Chairman, noticed at one hearing that the League was scheduled to testify last on the agenda, he said: "Because we want to be sure to hear what the League of Women Voters has to say, I'm going to change the order and hear from them now so we can be sure of not running out of time before we get to them." League water publications came in for their share of praise, too. Senator Scott held up "On the Water Front," also "Man and the River" (Delaware Basin study) for the audience to see when the spokesman for the Pennsylvania League mentioned these publications in her testimony. Senator Hart related that he took

League river basin studies home for his children to read, saying "they are good geography lessons."

The Leagues were grateful for an opportunity to state the most pressing problems in their states or river basins. This was the kind of information the Committee was seeking. The Leagues had no pet peeves to air, no pet projects to promote. They offered the Committee not final answers but lines of inquiry which, on the basis of League study, they believed the Committee might pursue in its search for a coordinated water resources policy.

Recurring themes in League testimony were population growth, metropolitan growth, increasing industrialization, flood control, irrigation, soil conservation, recreational needs, and the need of new procedures to solve water-supply and water-pollution problems involving more than one state. There was great diversity in problems in one sense, yet states as unlike as Wyoming and Maine found their basic problem the same—the need to expand their industrial base.

The following excerpts will give some of the flavor of the testimony. Spokesmen represented the state Leagues of:

"You can't take it with you" . . .

. . . but you can make sure it will do League work.

Here are three simple ways:

1. Make a direct bequest to the League in your will.
2. Provide for a direct transfer.
3. Set up a trust.

Consult your bank and your attorney as to how best to carry out your wishes.

Maine—"Formerly we depended upon textiles and wood products for our economic base. We are now planning the expansion of inland and coastal recreational facilities and the utilization of surplus labor in new, stable, and diversified industries."

Wyoming—"Many of Wyoming's fundamental economic problems result from a failure to develop and fully use its water resources. If our young people are to stay in the state there will have to be more and better jobs available. That probably means industry; and that means water."

North Dakota—"The Red River Basin's problems are being met by various international, interstate, federal, state, and local agencies, each of which has objectives of its own."

Utah—"We need to look at water resource development in regional terms in addition to the consideration we recommend be given the individual river basins."

Idaho—"Although Idaho lies most completely of all the four Pacific Northwest states within the Columbia Basin, the populations of its western neighbors are chiefly in an area of relatively abundant rainfall. With its thin population (650,000 people in the 14th largest state), with nearly 65 percent of its area in the public domain, with such a large part of its territory naturally arid, and with the obvious need for development, Idaho's concern about water is easy to understand."

Montana—"Montana's waters flow through one minor and two major watersheds to the Pacific, to the Gulf of Mexico, and to the Hudson Bay. They flow through three states to the

West, 12 to the East and South, and through Canada to the North. . . . There are four References before the International Joint Commission providing for allocation of water and power between Montana, British Columbia, and Alberta."

South Dakota—"We are concerned over the limited authority vested in the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee. This agency has only the power to coordinate and suggest, lacking any real power to decide and implement decisions."

California—"The West's problem has changed from putting more land into production to providing water for more people, more industry, and more recreational usage."

Oklahoma—"We have an abundant source of good quality water. However, the source of this particular supply is in the southeast corner of the state and the area where it is needed is toward the northwest of that point. The problem is either to lower the northwest corner so that the water flows by gravity to where it is needed, or else to achieve the same effect by artificial means."

Colorado—"No sizable stream flows into this state, and thus it is almost totally dependent upon the rain and snow that fall from the clouds above. Yet the rivers that spring from snows falling on the continental divide flow out of Colorado, and their waters must be shared with states downstream."

New Mexico—"Our problem is that our streams originate in Colorado and wind up in Texas or Arizona. Might there be some way in which the federal government could encourage and facilitate sensible changes in interstate compacts? It appears that the states tend more toward hauling their neighbor to court for nondelivery of nonexistent water, than toward amending what is proving to be an unworkable agreement."

Kansas—"Our most serious problem is the storage of water in times of plentiful or overabundant rainfall to provide for prolonged periods of in-

Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources

Democrats: Senators Kerr, Okla., Chairman; Chavez, N. M.; Ellender, La.; Magnuson, Wash.; Jackson, Wash.; Anderson, N. M.; Engle, Calif.; Hart, Mich.; McGee, Wyo.; Moss, Utah; Murray, Mont. (ex-officio). **Republicans:** Senators Kuchel, Calif., Vice Chairman; Young, N. D.; Schoeppel, Kan.; Case, S. D.; Martin, Iowa; Scott, Pa.

sufficient rainfall. It has been estimated that our losses from droughts far exceed losses from floods."

Arkansas—"Water pollution and floods seem to be the main problems of the Arkansas River Basin."

Louisiana—"Knowing that water movement is no respecter of political boundaries, we are forced to be concerned with the water problems of our neighboring states, and even with states well above us. What happens to water in those states will surely affect the water in Louisiana." This state also named salt-water intrusion as one of its major problems.

Michigan—"It is estimated that recreation will be the number one use made of all state and federal lands in Michigan. At the same time, watershed and wildlife management values must be conserved and the forests themselves protected if they are not to lose recreational desirability. With population increasing at an explosive rate, shorter working hours, and natural water sites becoming occupied, the need for positive recreational planning in water development will be imperative."

Iowa—"The interest and zeal and will-to-do of the American people can be captured by an integrated national policy which reaches from Washington to our smallest river basin and which challenges us to responsible action."

New England—The following testimony was given on behalf of 175 local Leagues in five states:

"The major issues which the New England states have in common are

pollution control, flood control, protection and development of our recreational facilities, and the conservation and development of our water supply. Because tourism ranks high as one of our income industries, the economy of these states will be hard hit unless pollution is controlled and recreational facilities expanded. While the over-all water supply will apparently be sufficient to meet increasing needs, there is an immediate necessity for the development of ground water supply and distribution, as well as the acquisition of new reservoir sites."

Representatives of state Leagues of Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island were at the hearing in Boston to present written statements in person; Massachusetts and Vermont Leagues filed written statements. New York and New Jersey state Leagues filed written statements at the hearing in Philadelphia. A Florida League spokesman testified at the hearing in Jacksonville. The Minnesota League filed a written statement at the hearing in Des Moines.

All Leagues expressed support of Senate Bill 2549 as a step in the direction of coordinated planning. (See September 1959 NATIONAL VOTER.) Many Leagues also pointed out the need to expand pollution control as proposed in H.R. 3610. (See June 1959 NATIONAL VOTER.) Both bills will come up in the second session of the 86th Congress.

And what will come out of the Senate hearings recently concluded? The Select Committee seemed optimistic about recommending legislation as a result of the 22 regional field hearings. While the League is ready and willing to consider such legislation, it feels much of value has already been achieved, as expressed in remarks of which the following is typical:

"Taking part in the hearing gave us who were there, and all League members by proxy, a sense of active participation in government which we do not often feel."

U.S. Senators and state League leaders at regional water hearings: 1) in California: Sen. Kerr, Mrs. J. van Overbeek; 2) in Pennsylvania: Sen. Scott, Mrs. G. M. Dusinger; 3) in South Dakota: Mrs. Edna S. Johnson, Sen. Case, Mrs. H. P. Rubida; 4) in Utah: Mrs. Paul Porter, Sen. Moss, Mrs. Ted Burnett; 5) in North Dakota: Mrs. Howard T. Moore, Senators Kuchel, Kerr, Young, McGee, U.S. Representative Burdick.



WORLD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Our Part in a Common Effort

Excerpts from the new League publication by the same title. Use this NATIONAL VOTER for your unit discussion. Better yet, read the pamphlet.

Many people think that the time has come to move forward into a long-range, adequate, comprehensive program of development assistance.

Is it in the interest of Americans to help the developing countries help themselves? In the interest of the American worker, whose livelihood depends upon the availability of jobs? Of the exporter, who needs more and more customers if his business is to continue to flourish? Of industries which use essential raw materials in which we are not self-sufficient? Of importers and consumers of such popular foodstuffs as bananas from Honduras, cocoa from Ghana, coffee from Brazil, and cane sugar from Cuba and the Philippines?

Special interests, of course, do not necessarily add up to the total national interest, which has to be seen in terms of what it will contribute to the security, freedom, and economic well-being of all Americans. And the surest way to guarantee these for ourselves is to assure that other members of the world community are also free, secure, and prosperous.

The variety of meanings given to "economic development" by the newly-awakened countries is startling, but their broad objectives in seeking help are consistent with the well-being of the United States and other economically advanced countries.

This broad agreement should not be allowed to obscure, however, the possibility that some of the developing countries' specific objectives may appear to be inadequate or illusory, or even in direct conflict with long-range purposes. Should the developed countries hold out for a more adequate, mature definition of the short-range objectives? Can ways be found to stimulate this process without seeming to dictate unduly to the inexperienced nations?

One hope lies in the potential role of disinterested economic theorists who can increase our understanding of the growth process and help to establish objective standards for de-

velopment. Another lies in the broadening of the cooperation among developed nations, so that enforcement of standards or giving of advice can be freed from the stigma of narrow self-interest.

Perhaps the key question is whether the nations that are able to provide assistance can succeed in demonstrating their genuine commitment to long-range goals. The developing countries want to know why we give aid: Is it primarily a weapon of the cold war? Is it charity? Is it given grudgingly? Or is it a sincere effort to join with all peoples as partners in progress?

Realities of Joint Effort

The most obvious reality is the gulf that separates the economic life of underdeveloped countries from that of advanced nations. Low income, undernourishment, and overpopulation are all typical of underdeveloped countries.

Yet the function of economic development is something more than improving living conditions; it is a first step in the creation and perpetuation of stable, effective, democratic societies. The objective is "not to redistribute income as between industrialized and developing countries" but "to help the developing countries into a stage of self-sustaining growth."

It should not be overlooked that the process requires an indispensable contribution from the developing countries. The primary responsibility for their economic development rests with them, and they should be expected to adopt programs of maximum self-help, within which they commit their own resources—facilities, materials, manpower, government organization—to the fullest de-

gree practicable. Economic aid, technical assistance, and investment from the industrial societies can be effective only if fitted into sound internal programs.

There are many cultural differences which create obstacles to an effective joint effort, such as the relative importance of material and spiritual values, the responsibility and role of the individual in society, or the possibility of improving the human lot by voluntary effort.

There are also serious gaps between aspirations of the leaders of the developing countries and their populations. The various bonds and traditions which have held back economic progress in the past continue to hamper the efforts of leaders who are eager to speed the processes of change. As a frustrated technical expert put it, "How in the world do you get these people to feel their felt needs?"

This does not mean that the talk about "the revolution of rising expectations" is exaggerated. As World Bank President Eugene Black puts it, "Revolution upon revolution is still needed in people's habits and attitudes towards life before there can be an escape from poverty."

Development Assistance

Technical cooperation encompasses all the ways in which human knowledge and skills can be shared among countries at various stages of development. Soon after the U.S. and U.N. technical assistance programs began, it became clear that "know-how" was not enough. Development loans for basic economic projects such as hydroelectric plants and highways would be needed, and special effort would be necessary to provide inducements for private investors.

The kinds of loans available from the existing public lending institutions include hard loans repayable in dollars, or other convertible currency (granted by the World Bank); loans made in dollars that are repayable in dollars or local (soft) currency (granted by the Development Loan Fund); and loans that are made and repaid in soft currency (granted under P.L. 480).

(Continued on page 4)

State ranks 11th in population; 2 main rivers provide 2482 miles of navigable waters; has 27 state parks, 8 national forests, 16 colleges and universities, nation's first school of journalism. City is nation's 8th largest, has 18 trunk-line railroads, reaches entire Mississippi Valley with water transportation, is served by 7 airlines, will soon be scene of important event.

What state? What city? What event?

Missouri—St. Louis—League national Convention, April 25-29.

(Continued from page 3)

There are also many other countries which have bilateral programs.

Soviet aid contrasts with that of the United States in several respects. Its total, much smaller and more limited geographically, has been given primarily for big industrial projects in countries not yet firmly committed in the cold war.

The use of Soviet trade as aid also contrasts with U.S. economic aid policy. Since foreign trade in the U.S.S.R. is a state monopoly, exports of machinery and industrial products can be readily exchanged for raw materials.

Nearly every developed country makes bilateral grants or loans and provides technical assistance to developing countries, territories, or colonies. European countries including the United Kingdom carry on programs, principally with their overseas territories. The six members of the European Economic Community (Common Market) have provided for joint development of overseas colonies. The Scandinavian countries are active in providing various forms of economic assistance.

Japan, the only industrialized nation in the Far East, cooperates with the western democracies in furnishing economic assistance.

Developing countries make large contributions to the projects for which they receive funds; their contribution normally exceeds that of the developed countries.

Related Programs and Policies

There are other U.S. programs and policies that contribute to economic development.

Three types of assistance under the Mutual Security Program—Defense Support, Special Assistance, the President's Contingency Fund—are in what one observer has called "a no

man's land." These are given as direct economic grants and are tied to political and military considerations. Because these are political or military in purpose and economic in form, they have caused confusion and misunderstanding.

P.L. 480 for disposing of our agricultural commodities abroad grew out of the domestic need to reduce the agricultural surpluses accumulated in this country. Administration of the program has made surplus disposal part of foreign economic policy as well as farm policy.

Many activities of the U.S. educational exchange programs supplement the educational purposes of our technical cooperation program.

The fragile economies of the developing countries are especially vulnerable because of their dependence on one or two raw materials for earning foreign exchange to buy the machinery and equipment they need for development. The developing countries plead that if we really want to help them help themselves, we should not only maintain a healthy, growing economy at home but be mindful of their needs in our trade policies and practices.

The Criticisms

The friends of foreign aid are concerned about the combining of military and economic aid in the same program and the relatively small amount provided for development assistance. They emphasize the lack of long-range planning and financing; they deplore undue preoccupation with cold-war motives.

The foes of foreign aid concentrate upon the financial "burden" of the program and upon the alleged injury to American business, labor, and the U.S. economy generally.

Are the criticisms based upon facts? Are they explicit? Are they documented? Or are they simply sweeping generalizations? What are the assumptions that underlie the criticisms? Are they based on a belief in economic self-sufficiency and isolation? Or do they accept interdependence among nations as a primary fact of the modern world?

Moving Toward a Sound Program

The conclusions of recent studies seem to suggest that an adequate, total program should be:

- Long-range enough to: provide

continuity in planning within both the administering agency and the recipient country; permit recruitment, training, and retention of desirable personnel; make possible a sustained partnership between developed country and developing countries.

- Large enough in size to avoid being a "mere nibbling at the fringes of the problems"; comprehensive enough to permit meeting various needs through appropriate means; sufficiently financed to provide at least something near the amount that could be effectively absorbed by the developing countries.

- Multilateral enough to: give the program scope and objectivity; take it out of the cold-war framework; spread costs and responsibilities among many nations; create a wide variety of trained personnel with knowledge and skills drawn from the world community.

- Coordinated enough to provide consistent policy direction for the total program; decentralized and flexible enough to allow joint planning within the developing country.

- Well enough administered to assure: economical use of funds; integrity of performance; steady pursuit of clearly defined goals; employment of qualified and dedicated personnel.

Can such a program evolve out of the present Mutual Security Program? Or will we have to "start from scratch"? One thing seems indispensable to either course of action: a clear-cut, coherent picture of what the ideal economic assistance program should be.

Pamphlet Tier

★ *World Economic Development: Our Part in a Common Effort.* The new pamphlet you've been waiting for. 50 cents.

★ *On the Water Front.* Two years old, but still a best seller. Basic document on water. 25 cents.

★ *Choosing the President, USA.* Subject is one you're probably already thinking about. CCCMF publication. 25 cents.

★ *Facts about the League of Women Voters.* Carry copies in your purse and give them away. 25 for 75 cents.

★ *Publications Catalog.* October edition of a semiannual favorite. Free.

★★ Order through your Publications Chairman or write to national office.

THE NATIONAL VOTER

Vol. IX January, 1960 No. 8

Published 10 times a year, monthly with exception of August and December, by the League of Women Voters of the United States
1026 17th Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

MRS. ROBERT J. PHILLIPS, President
DOROTHY FELKER GIRTON, Editor
Second class postage paid at
Washington, D. C.

Subscriptions: \$1.00 a year in United States and U. S. territories and possessions, Canada, Mexico;
all other countries, \$1.50 a year
Single copy: 10 cents
(Quantity prices on request)
Printed by National Publishing Co.